

REMARKS

I Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-4, and 9-10 and 12-13 are currently pending. Claim 11 has been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amended claim appears throughout the specification, for example at page 24, lines 18-27. No new matter has been added.

II Written Description

The Examiner has rejected Claim 11 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The limitations of Claim 11 have now been incorporated into Claim 1. The Examiner asserts that the range of 20 to 1500 is not disclosed in the specification. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to page 24, line 20, in the specification, where this range is taught. As this range does appear in the specification, a written description for Claim 1, as presently amended is present.

III Novelty

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, and 9-13 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Reilly (US 5,997,502). Further, the Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Wimmer (US 5,275,581) and under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nolan (US Pub 2001/0023336). In order to anticipate a Claim, a reference must teach each element of the Claim. None of the cited references disclose the limitation that the "roughened surface has a roughness of about No. 20 to 1500 as expressed in terms of count of sand paper". Reilly discloses a syringe barrel with a flange having reinforcing ribs (column 4, line 23), but there is no disclosure regarding the degree of roughness, provided by these structure. With regard to Wimmer and Nolan, the Examiner refers to structures on the flanges in the figures (Figure 1 and 2 of Wimmer and Figure 4A of Nolan) which are not discussed in the respective specifications, and therefore the claimed range of roughness is not taught. As the limitations of the Claims are not taught in the cited art, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, neither of the cited references even suggest the claimed surface-roughness limitation. Neither of these references have any feature that functions to increase friction with the flange groove. Thus, neither of these references would even suggest the roughened rear surface of the flange having a roughness of about No. 20 to 1500 as expressed in terms of count of sand paper, as presently claimed.

Appl. No. : 10/692,090
Filed : October 23, 2003


CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections are respectfully requested. Allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If any points remain that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-given telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 3-21-2004

By: 
Eric Ives
Registration No. 50,928
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(805) 547-5580

2438660
031306